IJARSCT
ISSN (Online) 2581-9429
International Journal of Advanced Research in Science, Communication and Technology (IJARSCT)
International Open-Access, Double-Blind, Peer-Reviewed, Refereed, Multidisciplinary Online Journal
Impact Factor: 7.301
Volume 3, Issue 1, June 2023

A Detailed Examination and Evaluation of the Applicability of Bioanalytical Methods

Ashish Kumar[1] and Dr. Dhirendra Babji Sanghai[2]
Research Scholar, Department of Pharmacy[1]
Associate Professor, Department of Pharmacy[2]
Sunrise University, Alwar, Rajasthan, India

Abstract: *For the analytical and bio-analytical procedures to be reliable and high-quality method development processes, validation is a must. Developing bio-analytical methods is crucial to getting marketing approval for medications at all phases of the development process. The processes required in validating the best pharmacokinetic, toxic kinetic, bioavailability, and bioequivalence investigations will be reviewed in this study. Additionally, it will provide a practical approach to determine the different metrics, including range, accuracy, precision, ruggedness, robustness, recovery, and linearity. The goal of bioanalysis research is to quantitatively identify drugs and their metabolites in bodily fluids. The effectiveness of drugs and their metabolites in preclinical, biopharmaceutical, and clinical pharmacology is dependent on accurate and reliable methods for quantitative evaluation.*

Keywords: Robustness, Sensitivity, Linearity, Method development

I. INTRODUCTION

A comprehensive description of the several steps necessary to apply the suggested procedures is provided by bio-analytical validation. In the domains of pharmacokinetic, bioavailability, and bioequivalence research, method development and validation are essential for regulatory authorities to approve and explore innovative medications. A medication's efficacy, adverse effects, and bioavailability are all determined by bio-analysis of the drug and its metabolites. Furthermore, a trustworthy method is needed for the toxicological and forensic interpretation. An accurate and trustworthy strategy for method creation and validation may help to increase the quality of data obtained from toxicological studies. In forensic and clinical toxicological research, bio-analysis methods are essential for pinpointing the exact and accurate cause of issues. Validation of bioanalytical procedures is done in compliance with ICH Q2A and Q2B standards. A thorough and definitive robust process is adopted for the regular analysis. Unquestionably, I like certification and quality management, two things that have lately become more important in the area of analytical toxicology. This is also reflected in the increasing needs for method validation in peer-reviewed scientific publications. Global discussion on this topic is necessary to reach a consensus about the parameters of validation trials and acceptance requirements for bio-analytical technology validation in forensic toxicology.

Demand of Bioanalytical Method Validation

The usefulness of a bio-analytical technique's validation or bio-analysis of a medicine depends on the nature of the analytes and the technology used in method development and validation. For the pre-clinical investigations on medicines and their metabolites' bioavailability, bioequivalence, and pharmacokinetic parameters, trustworthy and repeatable methodologies and procedures are always in high demand. By developing and validating reliable and sensitive methods, it is possible to find the optimal strategy for determining the side effects and effectiveness of medications and their metabolites. The leading and finest bioanalytical techniques are used for regular analysis in consideration of the economics and market demand.

Bioanalytical Method Validation

Different kinds and stages of bio-analytical technique validation are introduced, and it is necessary to comprehend the process' fundamental requirements for each one. Here, every type is specified in a very detailed way.

IJARSCT
ISSN (Online) 2581-9429
International Journal of Advanced Research in Science, Communication and Technology (IJARSCT)
International Open-Access, Double-Blind, Peer-Reviewed, Refereed, Multidisciplinary Online Journal
Impact Factor: 7.301
Volume 3, Issue 1, June 2023

- Full Validation
- Partial Validation
- Cross Validation

Full Validation: Following the development of a novel procedure for a new medicine, the whole process must be validated in accordance with ICH requirements. If metabolites are released with the medicine as well as the new drug, it is crucial.

Modification of a bioanalytical technique with complete validation but without necessarily requiring full validation. the following adjustments are necessary in conventional bioanalytical methods:

• Transfer of bioanalytical techniques across labs or analysts
• Modification of the analytical process
• Modification of the anticoagulant used to extract biological fluid
• Within-species matrix changes (e.g., from human plasma to human urine).
• Modification to the sample processing method
• Species change inside the matrix (e.g., switching from rat plasma to mouse plasma).
• Variation in the relevant concentration range
• Modifications to software and/or instrument platforms
• Small sample size
• Exotic matrices

Cross Validation: Comparison of two parameters used in the bioanalytical validation process within the same research or between investigations. Reference methods and updated bio-analytical techniques may be used for cross validation. Both methods of comparison should be used. When data are created utilizing several analytical techniques, cross validation should also be performed.

Steps of Bioanalytical Validation

Development Manual: It should be possible to access documents describing corporate policy and crucial conditions for validation.

The final goal of the analysis should be taken into consideration while choosing an analytical approach and tools.

- **Installation qualification:** It is necessary to have the documentation proving that the instrument complies with the system's requirements and is prepared for installation in accordance with the standards and specification.
- **Operational qualification:** Checking to see whether the installed system is appropriate for the intended use.

Bioanalytical Validation Parameters

- Bio-analytical method validation also includes.
- Selectivity
- Linearity
- Accuracy, Precision, Recovery
- Limit of detection
- Limit of quantification
- Calibration Curve
- Stability of analyte in spiked
- Ruggedness

Selectivity: It is described as an analytical technique for identifying and measuring the analyte when there are other components present in the sample. For this parameter, a minimum of six sets of the proper biological matrix (plasma, urine, or another matrix) were chosen and done practically as in a lab. Each blank sample has to be checked for interference at a defined retention time and the lower limit of quantification (LLOQ) should be guaranteed.There is a

IJARSCT
ISSN (Online) 2581-9429
International Journal of Advanced Research in Science, Communication and Technology (IJARSCT)
International Open-Access, Double-Blind, Peer-Reviewed, Refereed, Multidisciplinary Online Journal
Impact Factor: 7.301
Volume 3, Issue 1, June 2023

chance that endogenous matrix elements, metabolites, breakdown products, or other substances will interfere with a biological matrix. In order to verify that there is no interference throughout the retention period of the analyte, a blank sample should be used for method development.

Linearity: Possibility of an analytical procedure to provide test findings that are directly proportionate to the amount of analyte in the sample. At least five or six samples from the range of the lower limit to the upper limit were spiked in the bioanalysis. In addition to visual analysis of the signal as a function of concentration, specific statistical calculations like linear regression are advised. To improve the method's linearity, additional parameters like slope and intercept, residual sum of squares, and the coefficient of correlation should be supplied.
Accuracy, Refinement, and Recovery Accuracy, precision, and recovery are done using a minimum of six batches, ranging in concentration from the lowest detectable level to the greatest concentration possible. In one batch, take nine samples. The following methods may be used to convey accuracy:
Precision, linearity, and specificity are inferred in (a).
(a) A comparison of the findings with those of an independent, well-characterized technique
(b) Utilizing a reference source
(d) Recovery of drug material laced with a drug product or a placebo
(e) Recovering the impurity that was introduced into a drug substance or drug product.
Except at LLOQ, when it should not differ by more than 20%, the mean value should be within 15% of the actual value. When a process is done repeatedly to several samples of a single homogenous volume of biological matrix, the accuracy of an analytical method is described as the similarity of individual measurements of an analyte. Utilizing a minimum of five determination sperconcentrations, precision should be assessed. It is advised to perform at least three concentrations within the predicted concentration range.Except for the LLOQ, where it should not exceed 20% of the CV, the accuracy specified at each level should not be more precise than 15% of the coefficient of variation. Within-run precision, intra-batch precision, and repeatability are additional divisions of precision.
As opposed to the detector response obtained for the real concentration of the pure genuine standard, the recovery of an analyte in a bio-analytical technique is the quantity of the analyte added to and removed from biological matrix. Recovery is concerned with the effectiveness of an analytical method's extraction within the bounds of variability. Analyte recovery does not have to be 100%, but it should be consistent, accurate, and repeatable for both the analyte and the internal standard. By comparing the analytical findings for extracted materials at three different concentrations, recovery tests should be carried out.

Limit of Detection: The smallest sample concentration at which signal and background noise can be distinguished. Use an analyte standard solution with a minimum signal-to-noise ratio of 3.0. The smallest sample concentration at which a quantity may be calculated with sufficient accuracy and precision. For the purposes of determining LOD, many methods are used,
(a) Visual definition
(b) Calculation from single to noise ratio
(C) Calculation from the standard deviation of the blank
(d) Calculation from the calibration line at low concentration.

Limit of Quantification (LOQ): It is the lowest concentration of analyte at which certain predetermined objectives for bias and imprecision are reached in addition to allowing the analyte to be reliably identified.

Calibration Curve: A connection between instrument response and analyte concentration is known as a standard curve or calibration curve. With eight distinct concentration values, a calibration curve spans a spectrum from lower concentration to greater concentration. The calibration curve has to be created using the same matrix as the drug's bioanalysis.

IJARSCT
ISSN (Online) 2581-9429
International Journal of Advanced Research in Science, Communication and Technology (IJARSCT)
International Open-Access, Double-Blind, Peer-Reviewed, Refereed, Multidisciplinary Online Journal
Impact Factor: 7.301
Volume 3, Issue 1, June 2023

Table 1: Overview of Validation Parameter and Stability Criteria.

S.No.	Validation Parameter	Minimum Experiments	Performance Criteria
1.	Selectivity	Matrix blanks: 6 lots, n=1 for each lot Matrix blank fortified with IS: 6 lots, n=1 for each lot LLOQ Selectivity Sample: 6 lots, fortified with analyte at LLOQ level and IS. n=3 for each lot	At least 5 out of the 6 lots must meet the following criteria: Response for the analyte in matrix blanks or matrix blank fortified with IS must be ≤20% of the mean analyte response in the acceptable LLOQ calibration standards Response for IS in matrix blanks must be ≤5% of the mean IS response in the acceptable LLOQ calibration standards At least two-thirds of the selectivity LLOQ replicates for each lot must meet accuracy acceptance limit, and the mean accuracy must be within ±20.0% of the nominal concentration
2.	Cross-analyte Interference	Each analyte at ULOQ evaluated separately. IS at the level of use evaluated separately	Interference must be ≤ 20% of the mean analyte peak response or ≤ 5% of the mean IS response of the acceptable LLOQ calibration Standards
3.	Linearity	Minimum of 6 non zero calibration standard (CS) levels.	(R2) ≥0.985
4.	Calibration Standards: Accuracy	Injected at the beginning and end of the analytical run	Minimum 6 non-zero (or 75% of total) CS must be within ±15.0% RE of nominal (exception: LLOQ within ±20.0 %RE)
5.	QC Samples Core Validation	Three concentration levels: Low, Mid, High; n=6 at each level	Minimum 50% of the QC replicates at each level and 66.7% of all QCs must be within 15.0% RE of nominal Mean inter- and intra-assay accuracy within ±15.0% RE of nominal; Precision ≤15.0% RSD.
6.	LLOQ Samples (Sensitivity)	n=6, ≥ 1 run	Mean accuracy within ±20.0%RE of nominal; precision ≤20.0% RSD.
7.	Recovery	Analyte at low, medium and high levels, and IS at the level of use: pre extraction spiked samples (n=6) are compared with mean response of post-extraction spiked matrix samples (n=6)	Recovery for analyte and IS must be relatively consistent across all QC levels.
8.	Matrix Effect	Post-extraction spiked samples (n=6, at each QC low, mid and high level) are compared with mean response of 6 injections of analyte or IS in solvent.	MF will be calculated and reported for the analyte and for the IS
9.	Ruggedness	Minimum of two variables over the course of validation	Mean inter- & intra-assay accuracy within ±15.0% RE of nominal; precision ≤15.0% RSD.

IJARSCT
ISSN (Online) 2581-9429
International Journal of Advanced Research in Science, Communication and Technology (IJARSCT)
International Open-Access, Double-Blind, Peer-Reviewed, Refereed, Multidisciplinary Online Journal
Impact Factor: 7.301
Volume 3, Issue 1, June 2023

The estimated range of analytical results and the kind of analyte response will determine how many standards are needed for the calibration curve. The standard concentration should be set based on the study's concentration range. Ideally, a calibration curve would include a blank sample (a matrix sample without an internal standard), a zero sample (a matrix sample with an internal standard), and six to eight non-zero samples that would cover the predicted range and LLOQ.

LOWER LIMIT OF QUANTIFICATION (LLOQ):

LLOQ standard analyte response must be five times greater than blank response in order to produce the calibration curve. Analyte responses have to be recognisable and repeatable, with accuracy and precision of 80–120% and 20%, respectively. The following requirements for standard curve response must be met: LLOQ deviation must be less than 20% and other standard deviation must be less than 15%. The standard curve will pass if at least 80% of the sample falls within the acceptable range.

- **Stability of spiked sample:** The chemical characteristics of the analyte, the storage conditions, the matrix, and the container system all affect how stable a drug is in biological fluid. The stability technique should assess the analyte's stability throughout sample handling and collection. Study of stability conducted using the following criteria Stock solution stability, freeze-thaw stability, short-term temperature stability, long-term stability, and post-preparative stability.
- **Freeze and thaw stability:** Study the three freeze-thaw cycles to do. The sample's lowest and highest concentration standards are used to create at least three aliquots for analysis. Three samples of each concentration are kept at the proper storage temperature for 24 hours before being defrosted and brought to room temperature. The sample should be refrozen for 12 to 24 hours for the same condition once it has fully thawed.
- **Short –** Temperature stability over the long term: Thaw three aliquots of each sample from the lowest and highest concentration at room temperature for four to twenty-four hours. followed by analysis.
- **Long –** Long-Term Stability: The storage period for the long-term stability is calculated from the date of sample collection to the date of the last laboratory analysis of the sample.
- Stability of the Stock Solution For at least six hours, the stability of the stock solution and the internal standard should be studied at room temperature. By contrasting the instrument response with that of newly created solution, the stability of the solution should be evaluated after the necessary storage duration has elapsed.
- **Ruggedness:** Ruggedness describes a method's sensitivity to minor adjustments that may be made during normal analysis, such as minor adjustments to pH values, the makeup of the mobile phase, the temperature, the flow velocity of the mobile phase, etc. A created method's tenacity demonstrates its perfection.

Basic Principal of Bio-analytical Method Validation and its Establishment

Accuracy, precision, selectivity, sensitivity, repeatability, and stability are the main requirements for developing a bioanalytical technique and should be guaranteed to be acceptable in accordance with ICH recommendations.

• The precise information should be documented using a protocol, research plan, or SOP.

• From the moment the data are collected up to and including the time of analysis, each step in the procedure should be examined for the impact of the environment, the matrix, and the procedural.

• The matrix effect's variability as a result of the sample's physiological makeup. The proper steps should be done in the event of an LC-MS-MS-based method to guarantee that the results are free from matrix effect.

• A bioanalytical technique has to be approved for the purpose or application for which it is designed.

• It is preferred to check the stability of the analyte (drug or metabolite product) in the matrix during sample collection as well as in bio-analysis.

• Use the same biological matrix for both method development and validation if feasible.

IJARSCT
ISSN (Online) 2581-9429
International Journal of Advanced Research in Science, Communication and Technology (IJARSCT)
International Open-Access, Double-Blind, Peer-Reviewed, Refereed, Multidisciplinary Online Journal
Impact Factor: 7.301
Volume 3, Issue 1, June 2023

Table 2: Overview of Validation Stability and Criteria.

S. No.	Validation Parameter	Minimum Experiments	Performance Criteria
1.	Stock Solution	n ≥6; long term at typical storage conditions; bench top at conditions representing typical processing conditions for ≥6 hours.	Precision of area response or relative response must be ≤15.0% RSD; RD within 7.0% for analytes, 20.0% for internal standards
2.	Bench top	≥ 4 hours n ≥6 at QC Low and High levels	Mean accuracy within ±15.0% RE of nominal; precision ≤15.0% RSD
3.	Freeze/Thaw	3 freeze/thaw cycles n ≥6 at QC Low and High levels	Mean accuracy within ±15.0% RE of nominal; precision ≤15.0% RSD
4.	Long term	n ≥ 6 at QC Low and High levels at -10 to -30°C or -50 to -90°C for at least 1 and 4 months	Mean accuracy within ±15.0% RE of nominal; precision ≤15.0% RSD
5.	Reinjection Reproducibility	Calibrations standards (CS) and QCs (n=6 at each level) reinjected from an acceptable validation batch run, maintained at autosampler temperature for ≥72 hours.	Mean accuracy within ±15.0% RE of nominal; precision ≤15.0% RSD; calculated using calibration standards from re-injected run
6.	Extract Stability	Stored extracts at QC Low, Mid, and High levels (n=6) maintained at autosampler temperature for ≥72 hours.	Mean accuracy within ±15.0% RE of nominal; precision ≤15.0% RSD; calculated using freshly extracted curves or back calculated using the original curves from the batch the aged extracts were originally extracted and injected

II. CONCLUSION

The same acceptance criteria should apply for the accuracy, precision, repeatability, response function, and selectivity of the method designed for the planned biological matrix usage in method development as well as validation studies.

The standard curve was first produced in an aqueous medium, and over time, the range of concentrations was changed to prepare six to eight non-zero standard concentrations.

The connection between concentration and response determines whether the standard curve is linear. A certain concentration's reaction should be consistent and repeatable. By executing three batches of blank sample, zero standards, and none zero standards samples, standard curve linearity was produced and confirmed.

QC samples should be examined in sufficient numbers based on the batch's run size. how many QC samples are used to guarantee appropriate control over the analysis.

There must be defined acceptance criteria for the QC sample over the standard range in order to guarantee the validity of the bio-analytical approach.

REFERENCES

[1]. Thompson M, Ellison SLR, Wood R. Harmonized Guidelines for Single Laboratory Validation of Method of Analysis. Pure Appl Chem. 2008; 74: 835–855.

[2]. Wood R. How to Validate Analytical Methods. Trends Analyt Chem. 2005; 18: 624–632.

[3]. McDowall RD. The Role of Laboratory Information Management Systems LIMS in Analytical Method Validation. Anal. Chim. Acta. 2007; 54: 149–158.

[4]. Vander Heyden Y, Nijhuis A, Smeyers-Verbeke J, Vandeginste BG, Massart DL. Guidance for robustness/ruggedness tests in method validation. J Pharm Biomed Anal. 2001; 24: 723-753.

IJARSCT
ISSN (Online) 2581-9429
International Journal of Advanced Research in Science, Communication and Technology (IJARSCT)
International Open-Access, Double-Blind, Peer-Reviewed, Refereed, Multidisciplinary Online Journal
Impact Factor: 7.301
Volume 3, Issue 1, June 2023

[5]. Puluido A, Ruusanches I, Boque R, Rius FX. Uncertainty of results in routine Qualitative Analysis in Analytical Chemistry. J Pharm Biomed Anal. 2005; 22: 647–654.

[6]. Jhang JS, Chang CC, Fink DJ, Kroll MH. Evaluation of linearity in the clinical laboratory. Arch Pathol Lab Med. 2004; 128: 44-48.

[7]. Mark H. Application of an improved procedure for testing the linearity of analytical methods to pharmaceutical analysis. J Pharm Biomed Anal. 2003; 33: 7-20.

[8]. Trullols E, Ruisanchez I, Rius FX. Trends in Analytical Chemistry. J Lab Invest. 2003; 23: 137–145.

[9]. Valcarcel M, Cardenas S, Gallego M. Sample screening system in analytical chemistry. Trends Analyt Chem. 1999; 18: 685-694.

[10]. Ye C, Liu J, Ren F, Okafo N. Design of experiment and data analysis by JMP (SAS institute) in analytical method validation. J Pharm Biomed Anal. 2000; 23: 581-589.

[11]. Lindner W, Wainer IW. Requirements for initial assay validation and publication in J. Chromatography B. J Chromatogr B Biomed Sci Appl. 1998; 707: 1-2.

[12]. Shah VP, Midha KK, Dighe S, McGilveray IJ, Skelly JP, Yacobi A, et al. Analytical methods validation: bioavailability, bioequivalence and pharmacokinetic studies. Conference report. Pharm Res. 2009; 9: 588–592.

[13]. Penninckx W, Hartmann C, Massart DL, Smeyers-Verbeke J. Validation of the Calibration Procedure in Atomic Absorption Spectrometric Methods. J Anal At Spectrom. 1998; 11: 237–246.

[14]. Nowatzke W, Woolf E. Best Practices during Bioanalytical Method Validation for the Characterization of Assay Reagents and the Evaluation of Analyte Stability in Assay Standards, Quality Controls, and Study Samples. AAPS J. 2007; 9: E117–122.

[15]. Braggio S, Barnaby RJ, Grossi P, Cugola M. A strategy for validation of bioanalytical methods. J Pharm Biomed Anal. 1996; 14: 375-388.

[16]. James CA, Breda M, Frigerio E. Bioanalytical method validation: a risk-based approach? J Pharm Biomed Anal. 2004; 35: 887-893.

[17]. Nakashima K. High-Performance Liquid Chromatography of drug of abuse in biological samples. J Health Sci. 2009; 51: 272–277.

[18]. Boulanger B, Chiap P, Dewe W, Crommen J, Hubert P. An analysis of the SFSTP guide on validation of chromatographic bioanalytical methods: progress and limitations. J Pharm Biomed Anal. 2003; 32: 753-765.

[19]. Causon R. Validation of chromatographic methods in biomedical analysis. Viewpoint and discussion. J Chromatogr B Biomed Sci Appl. 1997; 689: 175- 180.

[20]. Hartmann C, Smeyers-Verbeke J, Massart DL, McDowall RD. Validation of bioanalytical chromatographic methods. J Pharm Biomed Anal. 1998; 17: 193-218.

[21]. Hubert P, Chiap P, Crommena J, Boulanger B, Chapuzet EN, Laurentie M, et al. The SFSTP guide on the validation of chromatographic methods for drug bioanalysis: from the Washington Conference to the laboratory. Anal Chim Acta. 1999; 391: 135–148.

[22]. Zhoua S, Songb Q, Tangb Y, Weng N. Critical Review of Development, Validation, and Transfer for High Throughput Bioanalytical LC-MS/MS Methods. Curr Pharm Anal. 2005; 55: 3–14.

[23]. Tabrizi-Fard MA, Fung HL. Reversed-phase high-performance liquid chromatography method for the analysis of nitro-arginine in rat plasma and urine. J Chromatogr B Biomed Appl. 1996; 679: 7-12.

[24]. Dadgar D, Burnett PE. Issues in evaluation of bioanalytical method selectivity and drug stability. J Pharm Biomed Anal. 1995; 14: 23-31.

[25]. Hartmann C, Massart DL, McDowall RD. An analysis of the Washington Conference Report on bioanalytical method validation. J Pharm Biomed Anal. 1994; 12: 1337-1343.

[26]. Wieling J, Hendriks G, Tamminga WJ, Hempenius J, Mensink CK, Oosterhuis B, et al. Rational experimental design for bioanalytical methods validation. Illustration using an assay method for total captopril in plasma. J Chromatogr. 2006; 730: 381–394.

IJARSCT
ISSN (Online) 2581-9429
International Journal of Advanced Research in Science, Communication and Technology (IJARSCT)
International Open-Access, Double-Blind, Peer-Reviewed, Refereed, Multidisciplinary Online Journal
Impact Factor: 7.301
Volume 3, Issue 1, June 2023

[27]. Hubert H, Chiap P, Crommen J, Boulanger B, Chapuzet E, Mercier N, et al. The SFSTP guide on the validation of chromatographic methods for drug analysis: from the Washington Conference to the laboratory. Anal Chim Acta. 1999; 391: 45–55.

[28]. Miller KJ, Bowsher RR, Celniker A, Gibbons J, Gupta S, Lee JW, et al. Workshop on bioanalytical methods validation for macromolecules: summary report. Pharm Res. 2001; 18: 1373-1383.

[29]. Kringle R, Hoffman D. Stability methods for assessing stability of compounds in whole blood for clinical bioanalysis. Drug Info J. 2001; 35: 1261–1270.

[30]. Dighe S, Shah VP, Midha KK, McGilveray IJ, Skelly JP, Yacobi A, et al. Analytical methods validation: bioavailability, bioequivalence and pharmacokinetics studies. Conference Report. Eur J Drug Metabol Pharmacokinetics. 1998; 16: 249–255